

**CAPITAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION
DOVER, DE**

WHEREAS, there are still questions, concerns, and inconsistencies regarding component 5 of the DPAS II Evaluation System;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Capital School District Board of Education declares that no professional employee in the Capital School District shall be placed on an improvement plan due to Component 5 until the Delaware Department of Education addresses the following concerns:

1. **Promoting Perverse Incentives and Low Standards:** A professional employee who sets higher goals for themselves and falls short of their lofty goals is punished while a professional employee who sets a lower bar that they know they can easily meet will be rewarded as a highly effective teacher/administrator. By its nature, this component encourages teachers, administrators, and districts to set low standards to be labeled effective.
2. **Changing Assessments:** With the move from DCAS to the Smarter Balanced Assessment, are we to put every teacher and administrator on an improvement plan considering that elected officials are predicting pass rates of 25%? How will administrators who are under improvement themselves be able to help teachers who are labeled ineffective and placed on improvement plans?
3. **Time Consuming Nature of Component 5:** While the Delaware Department of Education addressed the issue of time by cutting parts of Component 1 thru 4, they ignored the concerns regarding time consumption with Component 5. In some Professional Learning Communities, major amounts of time were consumed by Measures B and C of Component 5 as teachers and administrators walk a tight rope in the wording of their goals. One word could change how one is measured. This time could be better used in collaborating with their fellow professionals to align curriculum and develop plans of action for students with the greatest need rather than being forced to wordsmith based upon the specter of Component 5.
4. **State Pre and Post Tests:** First, many of the questions on these assessments are recycled DSTP questions, which have become incongruent with our move to Common Core and other changes to the curriculum to meet the expectations of DDOE. Second, who grades these assessments? In some districts, it is done by the teachers and administrators themselves while in others they are sent off to be graded. This is an inconsistency that shakes the core of this component.
5. **Punitive Nature of Component 5:** This component was designed so the DDOE could check off a box on the federal government's list of requirements. This component fails to take into account other extenuating circumstances that could impact student achievement. For instance, a student not receiving the reading accommodation that they may need on the DCAS due to a school looking out for its AYP participation rate. Are a teacher and administrator to be put on an improvement plan because we are unable to provide a legal accommodation to that student due to DDOE interpretation of USDOE AYP requirements?
6. **Positions Subject to Component 5 w/o Goals to Match:** This is an issue for professional employees who fall into Group 3. In many cases, these individuals are forced to put a square peg in a round hole. This leads to further inconsistency within this component.
7. **DCAS is incapable of measuring growth goals by the state:** In one classroom, the average margin of error was 25 points per test, and the average growth goal is 50 points; thus, the margin of error is enough to account for the growth or lack thereof.
8. **Legal Costs:** Will the DDOE reimburse a district for the legal fees that will be spent once a district decides to terminate the employment of an individual because of consistent lack of performance in Component 5?

Adopted this 18th day of September 2013 by the Capital School District Board of Education

Matthew J. Lindell, Board President

Phillip Martino, Jr., Board Member

Brian E. Lewis, Board Vice President

Sean P. M. Christiansen, Board Member